

1 PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
2 United States Attorney  
3 JESSICA A. MASSEY  
4 Assistant United States Attorney  
5 2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401  
6 Fresno, CA 93721  
7 Telephone: (559) 497-4000  
8 Facsimile: (559) 497-4099

9  
10  
11 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
12 United States of America

13  
14  
15 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
16 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

17  
18 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
19 Plaintiff,  
20 v.  
21 RODOLFO VALDIVIA,  
22 SUSA CHA,  
23 FRANCISCO CASTILLO ALCARAZ, and  
24 HUGO RAFAEL GAYTAN LOPEZ,  
25 Defendants

1  
2 CASE NO. 1:20-CR-00235-JLT-SKO  
3  
4 STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE  
5 TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;  
6 ORDER  
7  
8 CURRENT DATE: August 3, 2022  
9 TIME: 1:00 p.m.  
10 COURT: Hon. Sheila K. Oberto

11  
12 This case is set for status conference on August 3, 2022, for defendants RODOLFO VALDIVIA,  
13 SUSA CHA, FRANCISCO CASTILLO ALCARAZ, and HUGO RAFAEL GAYTAN LOPEZ. The  
14 parties seek to continue this matter to October 5, 2022.

15  
16 On May 13, 2020, this Court issued General Order 618, which suspended all jury trials in the  
17 Eastern District of California until further notice and allows district judges to continue all criminal  
18 matters. Under General Order 618, a judge “may exercise his or her authority to continue matters,  
19 excluding time under the Speedy Trial Act with reference to the court’s prior General Order 611 issued  
20 on March 17, 2020, . . . with additional findings to support the exclusion in the Judge’s discretion.”  
21 General Order 618, ¶ 6 (E.D. Cal. May 13, 2020). In addition, any judge “may order case-by-case  
22 exceptions” to General Order 618’s provisions “at the discretion of that Judge or upon the request of  
23 counsel, after consultation with counsel and the Clerk of the Court to the extent such an order will  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 impact court staff and operations.” General Order 618, ¶ 7 (E.D. Cal. May 13, 2020). This and other  
 2 General Orders were entered to address public health concerns related to COVID-19 (for example,  
 3 General Order 614—recently extended by General Order 652).

4       Although the General Orders address the district-wide health concern, the Supreme Court has  
 5 emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act’s end-of-justice provision “counteract[s] substantive  
 6 openendedness with procedural strictness,” “demand[ing] on-the-record findings” in a particular case.  
 7 *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). “[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no  
 8 exclusion under” § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. Moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at  
 9 509; *see also United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a  
 10 judge ordering an ends-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record “either orally  
 11 or in writing”).

12       Based on the plain text of the Speedy Trial Act—which *Zedner* emphasizes as both mandatory  
 13 and inexcusable—General Orders 611, 612, 617, and 618 require specific supplementation. Ends-of-  
 14 justice continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his  
 15 findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and  
 16 the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable  
 17 unless “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that  
 18 the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public  
 19 and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

20       The General Orders exclude delay in the “ends of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code  
 21 T4). Although the Speedy Trial Act does not directly address continuances stemming from pandemics,  
 22 natural disasters, or other emergencies, this Court has discretion to order a continuance in such  
 23 circumstances. For example, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a two-week ends-of-justice continuance  
 24 following Mt. St. Helens’ eruption. *Furlow v. United States*, 644 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1981). The court  
 25 recognized that the eruption made it impossible for the trial to proceed. *Id.* at 767-68; *see also United*  
 26 *States v. Correa*, 182 F. Supp. 326, 329 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (citing *Furlow* to exclude time following the  
 27 September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks and the resultant public emergency). The coronavirus is posing a  
 28 similar, albeit more enduring, barrier to the prompt proceedings mandated by the statutory rules.

In light of the societal context created by the foregoing, this Court should consider the following case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-justice exception, § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4).<sup>1</sup> If continued, this Court should designate a new date for the status conference. *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be “specifically limited in time”).

## STIPULATION

Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and the Defendants, by and through their counsel of record, Mr. Aed, Mr. Grantham, Mr. Torres, and Mr. Hawkins, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. By previous order, this matter was set for status on August 3, 2022.
2. By this stipulation, defendants now move to continue the status conference until October 5, 2022, and to exclude time between August 3, 2022, and October 5, 2022, under Local Code T4.

3. While the parties anticipate that the case may resolve without a trial, this is not yet a certainty. If defendants ultimately do not enter guilty pleas and decide to proceed to trial, the parties agree and stipulate, and request that the Court find the following:

a) The government asserts the discovery associated with this case includes reports, photographs, and numerous recordings. Initial discovery has been provided to all counsel and the government is currently processing additional discovery for production. The government is aware of its ongoing discovery obligations.

b) The government has extended plea offers to all defendants.

c) Counsel for the defendants desire additional time to consult with their clients, to review the current charges, to conduct investigation and research related to the charges, to review and/or copy discovery for this matter, to discuss potential resolutions with their clients, to prepare pretrial motions, and to otherwise prepare for trial.

d) Counsel for defendants believe that failure to grant the above-requested continuance would deny them the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into

<sup>1</sup> The parties note that General Order 612 acknowledges that a district judge may make “additional findings to support the exclusion” at the judge’s discretion. General Order 612, ¶ 5 (E.D. Cal. March 18, 2020).

1 account the exercise of due diligence.

2 e) The government does not object to the continuance.

3 f) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the  
4 case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendants in a trial within the  
5 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

6 g) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161,  
7 et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period of August 3, 2022, to October 5,  
8 2022, inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code  
9 T4], because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at defendants' request on the  
10 basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the  
11 best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

12 4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the  
13 Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial  
14 must commence.

15 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

16 Dated: July 16, 2022

PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
United States Attorney

17 /s/ JESSICA A. MASSEY  
18 JESSICA A. MASSEY  
19 Assistant United States Attorney

20 Dated: July 16, 2022

21 /s/ MICHAEL J. AED  
22 MICHAEL J. AED  
23 Counsel for Defendant  
24 RODOLFO VALDIVIA

25 Dated: July 16, 2022

26 /s/ REED B. GRANTHAM  
27 REED B. GRANTHAM  
28 Counsel for Defendant  
SUSA CHA

///  
///  
///

1 Dated: July 16, 2022

/s/ DAVID A. TORRES  
DAVID A. TORRES  
Counsel for Defendant  
FRANCISCO JAVIER CASTILLO  
ALCARAZ

4 Dated: July 16, 2022

/s/ EARLY M. HAWKINS  
EARLY M. HAWKINS  
Counsel for Defendant  
HUGO RAFAEL GAYTAN LOPEZ

7 **ORDER**

8  
9 The parties shall be prepared to select a mutually agreeable trial date at the next status  
conference.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 DATED: 7/20/2022

13 *Sheila K. Oberto*  
14 THE HONORABLE SHEILA K. OBERTO  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE